LIBRARY COPY

THEOSOPHY

A MAGAZINE DEVOTED TO

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, AND THE BROTHERHOOD OF HUMANITY

THE STUDY OF OCCULT SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY, AND ARYAN LITERATURE

Vol. XLVI—No. 11 **September, 1958**

TO thoroughly comprehend the idea underlying every ancient cosmology necessitates the study, in a comparative analysis, of all the great religions of antiquity; as it is only by this method that the root idea will be made plain. The original, transcendental and philosophical conception was one. But as systems began to reflect with every age more and more the idiosyncracies of nations, the main idea gradually became veiled with the overgrowth of human fancy.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

CONTENTS

WHERE THE DARK AND THE LIGHT BEGIN 481
HAVE ANIMALS SOULS? 486
ABOUT KILLING ANIMALS 496
GANDHI'S AND BUDDHA'S "AHIMSA" 498
NOTES ON PLATO'S SOCRATES 499
COUNTERACTING KARMA 503
THE SHAPE OF DEITY 507
THE PRESSURE OF ADVERSE THOUGHT 512
YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK—AND ANSWER 515
KNOWLEDGE OR BELIEF—WHICH SHALL IT BE? 518
ON THE LOOKOUT 519

$3.50 per Annum *35 Cents per Copy*

Edited and Published by

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY

245 West 33rd Street, Los Angeles 7, California, U. S. A.

Publisher's Announcements

THEOSOPHY: Established November, 1912, by Robert Crosbie. Published monthly by The Theosophy Company, at Los Angeles, California, U. S. A. This Magazine is edited independently of any theosophical society or other organization. The Publishers assume full responsibility for all unsigned articles herein.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: No subscriptions are accepted for less than one year of 12 numbers, but subscriptions may begin with any desired number. All subscriptions, orders for single back numbers, and back volumes, bound or unbound, should be accompanied by the necessary remittance. Price $3.50 per annum; single numbers of the current volume, 35 cents each; back numbers, 50 cents each; back volumes, unbound, $5.00 each; for library style binding, prices on request. *Volumes I and XII are out of print.*

COMMUNICATIONS: Contributions submitted for publication should be typewritten double-spaced on one side of the paper only, with wide margins, and copies should be in all cases retained by the writers, as no manuscripts are returned.

CORRESPONDENCE: Letters from subscribers and readers are welcomed, with criticisms, comments or questions on any subject treated in the magazine. Questions on Theosophical Philosophy and History will be replied to direct, or, if of sufficient general interest, in the pages of the Magazine.

BEQUESTS AND DONATIONS: Gifts and legacies will be gladly received from those in sympathy with the objects of this Magazine when such benefactions are unencumbered and unrestricted. Donors should make their gifts to

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY, of Los Angeles, California, U. S. A., which is an incorporated association, legally empowered to receive such donations and bequests in furtherance of its objects. These objects are:

(*a*) To form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or color;

(*b*) The study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and the demonstration of the importance of such study; and

(*c*) The investigation of the unexplained laws of Nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY
245 West 33rd Street
Los Angeles 7, California, U. S. A.

HE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS,
"Maitri-Bhavan"
15, Sir Krishna Rao Road,
BANGALORE-4, South India.

LIBRARY COPY

A U M

The time has not come to close any of the avenues of thought into the mysteries surrounding us. —W. MACNEILE DIXON

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLVI September, 1958 No. 11

WHERE THE DARK AND THE LIGHT BEGIN

THE thing that is obscure, and must remain obscure, for the student of Theosophy, no matter how much is written on the subject by the teachers, is the role and responsibility of the individual in the pursuit of truth. The obscurity springs from the fact that, in human development, the coming into true individuality must always result from independent discovery *by* the individual. It is this self-initiation which qualifies the disciple to receive help or initiation at the hands of his teachers. It is the practice of self-reliance in the midst of painful uncertainty which proves the presence of an awakening Manasic principle—the organ of the soul's growth.

Since the soul is compounded, as Plato said, of the Same and the Other—of the One and the Many—the response of the human being to experience is twofold. Man responds in terms of love, or a sense of unity, the feeling of having common being-hood; and he responds in terms of differences, through which he comes to understand and know the wide universe which surrounds him. There is no ultimate reason for feeling and thought to be at odds in the subjective world of the individual, for ultimately, the two are one, yet throughout the relativities of limited experience, feeling and thought are opposed vocabularies of perception. They reveal opposite realities, announce the polarity of man's being.

Thought and feeling do, however, gain conditioned synthesis or unity in acts—they are fused, that is, by the will, which makes the being whole, and at the same time initiates the sequences in cause and effect which produce Karma and make of the individual a continuing identity

in *time.* Awareness of the alienation between thought and feeling comes during hours of reflection, when the mind is making an assay of being, and wondering at the difference between these two modes of human intelligence.

The contrast becomes striking when ancient counsels of perfection are the subject-matter for examination. The injunction always relates to a state of feeling, yet the feelings are not immediately responsive to the resolves that men make. Further, resolves are sometimes of a sort that cannot be fulfilled. A man, for example, may tell himself that he will behave in a certain way, conformable to the example of the wise; yet his motive for this intention, which remains hidden, is not the same as the motive of the wise. Accordingly, he cannot behave as the wise behave; he can only imitate the exterior appearance of wise action, or what he supposes is the appearance of wise action. And such imitations are always unsuccessful, since wisdom is the one thing in the universe that cannot be imitated, for wisdom has no form. Wisdom is an essence which subsists without form, although it may gain endless embodiments.

It is this, the formless nature of wisdom, which creates the obscurity of the path sought by the one who seeks truth. All other paths have form, but not the path of wisdom. So it is that whenever the disciple comes to a crossroads where wisdom is required for his decision, all examples, all signs and indications, melt away. He is alone with himself, with only his private thoughts and his private feelings to guide him.

Then, often, comes anger, and the sense of being betrayed. How can he, who has been so faithful, be at such a loss for what to do? He searches the texts, but they are mute. He follows the rules, yet his feelings resist the very practice in which he has schooled himself. These capacities he thought he had possessed—where are they? Other men with lesser dreams are far more skillful, and the paths they follow are cunningly built and carefully marked.

Here, no doubt, is one of the abysses which must be crossed, somehow, by the disciple. It may be an early abyss, or a late one, yet it seems an inevitable encounter for the man in search of knowledge. The question is, what sort of knowledge does he seek? Is it to be *his* knowledge? Will possessing it do something for *him?*

The knowledge which the disciple of the Wisdom Religion seeks can never, alas, be a "possession." It exists in no private containers and it adds not one whit to the stature of the one who gains it. In the presence of anxiety it departs, leaving hardly a memory behind. It is a knowledge

which has no relation to persons and moves only in the free air of formless egoity. It is a knowledge the thought of which has inseparable unity with feeling, since it is generated at a source where thought and feeling are as yet undivided, still enjoy their primeval spiritual unity.

For the world, thought and feeling remain disparted and in their most orderly forms are called science and religion. The concern of science is with the Many, for religion, it is the One. Science is constructed by and invites the mind, while religion speaks to the heart, and the response of the heart is called Devotion. The two are different, opposite in nature, and yet each order of being and action calls persistently for its other half. In science, the mind is continually generating a kind of "ghost" of the unity which its method and intentions deny; while religion finds itself continually invaded by the temper and habits of rational inquiry. It seems that these two are and ought to be eternally separate, yet both are subject to strange compromises in the name of the other. Spurious religions are made in the guise of pretentiously pursued courses of intellectual inquiry, and men of science often imagine themselves endowed with a godlike capacity to say where science leaves off and religion begins.

So, also, in the life of the individual. His rules, his principles, the manuals of devotion he studies, are sometimes forced into the artificial role of doing duty for the feeling he longs for, but cannot seem to experience. And now the deep bewilderments attending the quest for a higher life may begin. What is a rule, a teaching, or a precept? It is a drawing, in words, of a feeling as yet unfelt.

Here, the genius and art of teaching becomes of the greatest importance. How far can a man's practice of rules, teachings, precepts, outrun the feelings that he has about them? Not very far, and the true teacher knows it. For this reason, Plato, when he came to deeply subtle or difficult transcendental conceptions, resorted to myth to keep his readers from too literal a view of such matters. He did not want them to attempt to follow diagrammatic instructions of a course that cannot, in the nature of things, be diagrammed. Whenever you say that doing thus and so is wise behavior, you reduce the truth of wisdom to a kind of "average" truth which has only statistical validity. The wisest of teachers usually pepper their direct admonitions with intentionally confusing paradoxes. Why should a teacher wish to confuse? He wishes to confuse all but the self-reliant intelligence. If he can bewilder and frustrate the imitative faculty, if he can harass the egotism of those who

look to him for instruction, there is some hope that they will in desperation turn to thinking for themselves.

In the third discourse of the *Bhagavad-Gita,* Krishna sets the stage in this way, making Arjuna exclaim:

> Thou, as it were with doubtful speech, confusest my reason; wherefore choose one method amongst them by which I may obtain happiness and explain it unto me.

Krishna has upset Arjuna by belittling the feelings of piety and devotion in which Arjuna had found personal security. Krishna is not impressed by Arjuna's declaration of righteous intentions. He as much as tells Arjuna that it is time for him to stop relying on the conventional morality of his time. He also suggests that those who are able to live according to inner perception are few in number, and that what they do cannot always be explained to others:

> Those who have not this knowledge are interested in the actions brought about by the qualities; and he who is perfectly enlightened should not unsettle those whose discrimination is weak and knowledge incomplete, nor cause them to relax from their duty.

Now the truth is beginning to come out. For Arjuna, there is no longer any safety in numbers. He has to find his own way. "It is better," says Krishna," to do one's own duty, even though it be devoid of excellence, than to perform another's duty well." What, in this case, is the duty of another? It is always a duty which, under definition, is both specific and applicable to large numbers of men. Such definitions are always concerned with the disciplining of the common psyche and cannot comprehend the issues which confront the discriminating principle. They are like principles of engineering, applicable to the semi-material "stuff" of the astral man. Arjuna, however, is in quest of a higher knowledge than this. He is already a great success in the lesser disciplines of life. He is a handsome young man and a great warrior. He has learned everything his culture can teach him. He knows the religion of his time and can quote the scripture with scholarly distinction. But Krishna, the teacher, takes all this away from him. These achievements, he points out, are for *corporeal* beings. Arjuna is at the great divide in human life, torn between the excellences of corporeality and the beckoning mysteries of incorporeality. "The path of the unmanifested," Krishna cautions him, "is with difficulty obtained by corporeal beings."

Arjuna is not to abandon anything he has learned; the rules still apply, the precepts still embody wisdom; but Arjuna has to learn to see all these things in a new light, *his own* light. This is what frightens him, for he feels that his light is dim. But Krishna's light, as the eleventh discourse shows, frightens him still more. So, he is thrown back upon himself.

Unmistakably, to be thrown back upon oneself is the ultimate trial. It brings the final crisis, for the individual, for society.

No man, no civilization, ever feels ready for or equal to this crisis. Always they complain, as Arjuna complained. Always they cry out how faithful they have been. Always they insist they deserve the consideration and guidance which they are in the habit of relying on. Always they reproach the gods and their teachers or preceptors. It is a bad time.

What will help a man, now? Only the self can help him—the self he is, and has been, from the beginning. Now his motives appear, naked in the light of the self. Why has he sought for truth? Was it the spontaneous love of being for knowledge? Was it the self-forgetful hunger of the mind, the act which is its own provocation, undertaken for no other reason than that it is the nature of the mind to know? In this hour, all other purposes go down like tenpins. They have no strength, no dirigibility, in the rarefied atmosphere of the higher man. And the love he bears his fellows—is it the secret, irrepressible affection of man for man? Or does it wish for an audience? Is it an act of piety, a response to some kind of "ought," a calculation of virtue, a transaction offered, a means and not an end?

There is the self, and there are the imitations of the self—the Same and the Other, even as Plato said. The self is known by recognition of its own, spontaneous motions. The self forever seeks the self, through knowledge and through love or devotion. The acts of the self are always spontaneous, and their ends are always the self, perfectly fearless, perfectly free, timeless, and perfectly fulfilled. To think and feel as the self—this is the role and the responsibility of the individual in the pursuit of truth.

HAVE ANIMALS SOULS?

[The following article by H. P. Blavatsky supplies the full frame of reference for the sharp distinction between theosophical and orthodox Christian doctrines on the relationship between man and the lower orders of Nature. From one standpoint, it will be realized, the division between man and animals is a sharp one. On the other hand, these distinctions should not allow a glib denial that "animals have souls," for everything depends upon what is meant by the word "soul." There is an indwelling intelligence within each animal, H.P.B. affirms, which has its own kind of immortality, and with which all humans are linked in the interdependency of evolution.

This article originally appeared in three parts in *The Theosophist* for January, February, March, 1886, and was last printed in THEOSOPHY for November, December, 1918, and January, 1919. The present reprint divides the article into two sections.—Eds. THEOSOPHY.]

I

Continually soaked with blood, the whole earth is but an immense altar upon which *all that lives has to be immolated*—endlessly, incessantly.—Comte Joseph De Maistre. (*Soirées* 1 ii, 35.)

MANY are the "antiquated religious superstitions" of the East which Western nations often and unwisely deride: but none is so laughed at and practically set at defiance as the great respect of Oriental people for animal life. *Flesh*-eaters cannot sympathize with total abstainers from meat. We Europeans are nations of civilized barbarians with but a few millenniums between ourselves and our cave-dwelling forefathers who sucked the blood and marrow from uncooked bones. Thus, it is only natural that those who hold human life so cheaply in their frequent and often iniquitous wars, should entirely disregard the death-agonies of the brute creation, and daily sacrifice millions of innocent, harmless lives; for we are too epicurean to devour tiger steaks or crocodile cutlets, but must have tender lambs and golden-feathered pheasants. All this is only as it should be in our era of Krupp cannons and scientific vivisectors. Nor is it a matter of great wonder that the hardy European should laugh at the mild Hindu, who shudders at the bare thought of killing a cow, or that he should refuse to sympathize with the Buddhist and Jain, in their respect for the life of every sentient creature—from the elephant to the gnat.

But, if meat-eating has indeed become a vital necessity—"the tyrant's plea!"—among Western nations; if hosts of victims in every city, borough and village of the civilized world must needs be daily

slaughtered in temples dedicated to the deity, denounced by St. Paul and worshipped by men "whose God is their belly:"—if all this and much more cannot be avoided in our "age of Iron," who can urge the same excuse for sport? Fishing, shooting, and hunting, the most fascinating of all the "amusements" of civilized life—are certainly the most objectionable from the standpoint of occult philosophy, the most sinful in the eyes of the followers of these religious systems which are the direct outcome of the Esoteric Doctrine—Hinduism and Buddhism. Is it altogether without *any* good reason that the adherents of these two religions, now the oldest in the world, regard the animal world—from the huge quadruped down to the infinitesimally small insect—as their "younger brothers," however ludicrous the idea to a European? This question shall receive due consideration further on.

Nevertheless, exaggerated as the notion may seem, it is certain that few of us are able to picture to ourselves without shuddering the scenes which take place early every morning in the innumerable shambles of the so-called civilized world, or even those daily enacted during the "shooting season." The first sun-beam has not yet awakened slumbering nature, when from all points of the compass myriads of hecatombs are being prepared to salute the rising luminary. Never was heathen Moloch gladdened by such a cry of agony from his victims as the pitiful wail that in all Christian countries rings like a long hymn of suffering throughout nature, all day and every day from morning until evening. In ancient Sparta—than whose stern citizens none were ever less sensitive to the delicate feelings of the human heart—a boy when convicted of torturing an animal for amusement, was put to death as one whose nature was so thoroughly villainous that he could not be permitted to live. But in civilized Europe—rapidly progressing in all things save Christian virtues—*might* remains unto this day the synonym of *right*. The entire useless, cruel practice of shooting for mere sport countless hosts of birds and animals is nowhere carried on with more fervour than in Protestant England, where the merciful teachings of Christ have hardly made human hearts softer than they were in the days of Nimrod, "the mighty hunter before the Lord." Christian ethics are as conveniently turned into paradoxical syllogisms as those of the "heathen." The writer was told one day by a sportsman that since "not a sparrow falls on the ground without the will of the Father," he who kills for sport —say, one hundred sparrows—does thereby one hundred times over—his Father's will!

A wretched lot is that of poor brute creatures, hardened as it is into implacable fatality by the hand of man. The *rational* soul of the human being seems born to become the murderer of the *irrational* soul of the animal—in the full sense of the word, since the Christian doctrine teaches *that the soul of the animal dies with its body.* Might not the legend of Cain and Abel have had a dual signification? Look at that other disgrace of our cultured age—the scientific slaughter-houses called "vivisection rooms." Enter one of those halls in Paris, and behold Paul Bert, or some other of these men—so justly called "the learned butchers of the Institute"—at his ghastly work. I have but to translate the forcible description of an eye-witness, one who has thoroughly studied the *modus operandi* of those "executioners," a well-known French author:—

"Vivisection" he says—"is a speciality in which *torture,* scientifically economised by our butcher-academicians, is applied during whole days, weeks, and even months to the fibres and muscles of one and the same victim. It (torture) makes use of every and any kind of weapon, performs its analysis before a pitiless audience, divides the task every morning between ten apprentices at once, of whom one *works* on the eye, another one on the leg, the third on the brain, a fourth on the marrow; and whose inexperienced hands succeed, nevertheless, towards night after a hard day's work, in laying bare the whole of the living carcass they had been ordered to *chisel* out, and *that* in the evening, is carefully stored away in the cellar, in order that early next morning it may be worked upon again if only there is a breath of life and sensibility left in the victim! We know that the trustees of the Grammont law (*loi*) have tried to rebel against this abomination; but Paris showed herself more inexorable than London and Glasgow."[1]

And yet these gentlemen boast of the *grand* object pursued, and of the *grand* secrets discovered by them. "Horror and lies!"—exclaims the same author. "In the matter of secrets—a few localisations of faculties and cerebral motions excepted—we know but of one secret that belongs to them by rights: it is the secret of torture eternalised, beside which the terrible natural law of *autophagy* (mutual manducation), the horrors of war, the merry massacres of sport, and the sufferings of the animal under the butcher's knife—are as nothing! Glory to our men of science! They have surpassed every former kind of torture, and remain now and

[1] *De la Resurrection et du Miracle.* E De Mirville.

for ever, without any possible contestation, the kings of artificial anguish and despair!"[2]

The usual plea for butchering, killing, and even for legally torturing animals—as in vivisection—is a verse or two in the Bible, and its ill-digested meaning, disfigured by the so-called scholasticism represented by Thomas Aquinas. Even De Mirville, that ardent defender of the rights of the church, calls such texts—"Biblical tolerances, *forced from God* after the deluge, as so many others, and based upon the decadence of our strength." However this may be, such texts are amply contradicted by others in the same Bible. The meat-eater, the sportsman and even the vivisector—if there are among the last named those who believe in special creation and the Bible—generally quote for their justification that verse in Genesis, in which God gives *dual* Adam— "dominion over the fish, fowl, cattle, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth"—(Ch. i., v. 28); hence—as the Christian understands it—power of life and death over every animal on the globe. To this the far more philosophical Brahman and Buddhist might answer: "Not so. Evolution starts to mould future humanities within the lowest scales of being. Therefore, by killing an animal, or even an insect, we arrest the progress of an entity towards its final goal in nature—MAN;" and to this the student of occult philosophy may say "Amen," and add that it not only retards the evolution of that entity, but arrests that of the next succeeding human and more perfect race to come.

Which of the opponents is right, which of them the more logical? The answer depends mainly, of course, on the personal belief of the intermediary chosen to decide the questions. If he believes in special creation—so-called—then in answer to the plain question—"Why should homicide be viewed as a most ghastly sin against God and nature, and the murder of millions of living creatures be regarded as mere sport?"—he will reply:—"Because man is created in God's own image and looks *upward* to his Creator and to his birth-place—heaven (*os homini sublime dedit*); and that the gaze of the animal is fixed *downward* on *its* birth-place—the earth; for God said—'Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind'," (Genesis I, 24). Again, "because man is endowed with an immortal soul, and the dumb brute has no immortality, not even a short survival after death."

---

[2] *De la Resurrection et du Miracle.* E. De Mirville.

Now to this an unsophisticated reasoner might reply that if the Bible is to be our authority upon this delicate question, there is not the slightest proof in it that man's birth-place is in heaven any more than that of the last creeping things—quite the contrary; for we find in Genesis that if God created "man" and blessed "them" (Ch. I, v. 27-28) so he created "great whales" and "blessed them" (21-22). Moreover, "the Lord formed man of the dust of the ground" (II, 7): and "dust" is surely earth pulverized? Solomon, the king and preacher, is most decidedly an authority and admitted on all hands to have been the wisest of the Biblical sages; and he gives utterances to a series of truths in Ecclesiastes (Ch. III) which ought to have settled by this time every dispute upon the subject. "The sons of men. . . . might see that they themselves are beasts" (v. 18) . . . . "that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth the beasts. . . . a man has no pre-eminence above a beast,"—(v. 19) "all go into one place; all are of the dust and all turn to dust again," (v. 20) . . . . "*who* knoweth the spirit of man that goeth *upwards,* and the spirit of the beast, that goeth *downward* to the earth?" (v. 21.) Indeed, "who knoweth!" At any rate it is neither science nor "school divine."

Were the object of these lines to preach vegetarianism on the authority of Bible or Veda, it would be a very easy task to do so. For, if it is quite true that God gave *dual* Adam—the "male and female" of Chapter I of Genesis—who has little to do with our henpecked ancestor of Chapter II—"dominion over every living thing," yet we nowhere find that the "Lord God" commanded that Adam or the other to devour animal creation or destroy it for sport. Quite the reverse. For pointing to the vegetable kingdom and the "fruit of a tree yielding seed"—God says very plainly: "to you (men) it shall be *for meat.*" (I, 29.)

So keen was the perception of this truth among the early Christians that during the first centuries they never touched meat. In *Octavio* Tertullian writes to Minutius Felix: "we are not permitted either to witness, or even hear narrated (*novere*) a homicide, we Christians, *who refuse to taste dishes in which animal blood may have been mixed.*"

But the writer does not preach vegetarianism, simply defending "animal rights" and attempting to show the fallacy of disregarding such rights on Biblical authority. Moreover, to argue with those who would reason upon the lines of erroneous interpretations would be quite useless. One who rejects the doctrine of evolution will ever find his way paved with difficulties; hence, he will never admit that it is far

more consistent with fact and logic to regard physical man merely as the recognized paragon of animals, and the spiritual Ego that *informs* him as a principle midway between the soul of the animal and the deity. It would be vain to tell him that unless he accepts not only the verses quoted for his justification but the whole Bible in the light of esoteric philosophy, which reconciles the whole mass of contradictions and *seeming* absurdities in it—he will never obtain the key to the truth;—for he will not believe it. Yet the whole Bible teems with charity to men and with mercy and love to animals. The original Hebrew text of Chapter XXIV of Leviticus is full of it. Instead of the verses 17 and 18 as translated in the Bible: "And he that killeth a beast shall make it good, beast for beast" in the original it stands:—"Life for life," or rather "soul for soul," *nephesh tachat nephesh.*[3] And if the rigour of the law did not go to the extent of killing, as in Sparta, a man's "soul" for a beast's "soul"—still, even though he replaced the slaughtered soul by a living one, a heavy additional punishment was inflicted on the culprit.

But this was not all. In Exodus (Ch. XX, 10, and Ch. XXIII, 2 *et seq.*) rest on the Sabbath day extended to cattle and every other animal. "The seventh day is the sabbath . . . . thou shalt not do any work, thou nor thy . . . . cattle;" and the Sabbath *year* . . . . "the seventh year thou shalt let it (the land) rest and lie still . . . . that thine ox and thine ass may rest"—which commandment, if it means anything, shows that even the brute creation was not excluded by the ancient Hebrews from a participation in the worship of their deity, and that it was placed upon many occasions on a par with man himself. The whole question rests upon the misconception that "soul," *nephesh,* is entirely distinct from "spirit"—*rauch.* And yet it is clearly stated that "God breathed into the nostrils (of man) *the breath of life* and man became a living soul," *nephesh,* neither more nor less than an animal, for the soul of an animal is also called *nephesh.* It is by development that the soul becomes *spirit,* both being the lower and the higher rungs of one and the same ladder whose basis is the UNIVERSAL SOUL, or spirit.

This statement will startle those good men and women who, however much they may love their cats and dogs, are yet too much devoted to the teachings of their respective churches ever to admit such a heresy. "The *irrational* soul of a dog or a frog divine and immortal as our own

[3] Compare also the difference between the translation of the same verses in the *Vulgata,* and the texts of *Luther* and *De Wette.*

souls are?"—they are sure to exclaim: but so they are. It is not the humble writer of the present article who says so, but no less an authority for every good Christian than that king of the preachers—St. Paul. Our opponents who so indignantly refuse to listen to the arguments of either modern or esoteric science may perhaps lend a more willing ear to what their own saint and apostle has to say on the matter; the true interpretation of whose words, moreover, shall be given neither by a theosophist nor an opponent, but by one who was as good and pious a Christian as any, namely, another saint—John Chrysostom—he who explained and commented upon the Pauline Epistles, and who is held in the highest reverence by the divines of both the Roman Catholic and the Protestant churches. Christians have already found that experimental science is not on their side; they may be still more disagreeably surprised upon finding that no Hindu could plead more earnestly for animal life than did St. Paul in writing to the Romans. Hindus indeed claim mercy to the dumb brute only on account of the doctrine of transmigration and hence of the sameness of the principle or element that animates both man and brute. St. Paul goes further: he shows the animal *hoping* for, and *living in the expectation of the same "deliverance from the bonds of corruption"* as any good Christian. The precise expressions of that great apostle and philosopher will be quoted later on in the present Essay and their true meaning shown.

The fact that so many interpreters—Fathers of the Church and scholastics,—tried to evade the real meaning of St. Paul is no proof against its inner sense, but rather against the fairness of the theologians whose inconsistency will be shown in this particular. But some people will support their propositions, however erroneous, to the last. Others, recognizing their earlier mistake, will, like Cornelius a Lapide, offer the poor animal *amende honorable.* Speculating upon the part assigned by nature to the brute creation in the great drama of life, he says: "The aim of all creatures is the service of man. Hence, together with him (their master) they are waiting for their renovation"—*cum homine renovationem suam expectant.*[4] "Serving" man, surely cannot mean being tortured, killed, uselessly shot and otherwise misused; while it is almost needless to explain the word "renovation." Christians understand by it the renovation of bodies after the second coming of Christ; and limit it to man, to the exclusion of animals. The students of the *Secret Doc-*

[4] *Commen. Apocal.*, ch. v. 137.

trine explain it by the successive renovation and perfection of forms in the scale of objective and subjective being, and in a long series of evolutionary transformations from animal to man, and upward. . . .

This will, of course, be again rejected by Christians with indignation. We shall be told that it is not thus that the Bible was explained to them, nor can it ever mean that. It is useless to insist upon it. Many and sad in their results were the erroneous interpretations of that which people are pleased to call the "Word of God." The sentence "cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren" (Gen. IX. 25),—generated centuries of misery and undeserved woe for the wretched slaves—the negroes. It is the clergy of the United States who were their bitterest enemies in the anti-slavery question, which question they opposed *Bible in hand.* Yet slavery is proved to have been the cause of the natural decay of every country; and even proud Rome fell because "the majority in the ancient world were slaves," as Geyer justly remarks. But so terribly imbued at all times were the best, the most intellectual Christians with those many erroneous interpretations of the Bible, that even one of their grandest poets, while defending the right of man to freedom, allots no such portion to the poor animal.

> God gave us only over beast, fish, fowl,
> Dominion absolute; that right we hold
> By his donation; but man over man
> He made not lord; such title to himself
> Reserving, human left from human free.

—says Milton.

But, like murder, error "will out," an incongruity must unavoidably occur whenever erroneous conclusions are supported either against or in favor of a prejudged question. The opponents of Eastern *philozoism* thus offer their critics a formidable weapon to upset their ablest arguments by such incongruity between premises and conclusions, facts postulated and deductions made.

It is the purpose of the present Essay to throw a ray of light upon this most serious and interesting subject. Roman Catholic writers in order to support the genuineness of the many miraculous resurrections of animals produced by their saints, have made them the subject of endless debates. The "soul in animals" is, in the opinion of Bossuet, "the most difficult as the most important of all philosophical questions."

Confronted with the doctrine of the Church that animals, though not soulless, have no *permanent* or immortal soul in them, and that the

principle which animates them dies with the body, it becomes interesting to learn how the school-men and the Church divines reconcile this statement with that other claim that animals may be and have been frequently and miraculously resurrected.

Though but a feeble attempt—one more elaborate would require volumes—the present Essay, by showing the inconsistency of the scholastic and theological interpretations of the Bible, aims at convincing people of the great criminality of taking—especially in sport and vivisection—animal life. Its object, at any rate, is to show that however absurd the notion that either man or brute can be resurrected after the life-principle has fled from the body for ever, such resurrections—if they were true—would not be more impossible in the case of a dumb brute than in that of a man; for either both are endowed by nature with what is so loosely called by us "soul," or neither the one nor the other is so endowed.

> What a chimera is man! what a confused chaos, what a subject of contradiction! a professed judge of all things, and yet a feeble worm of the earth! the great depository and guardian of truth, and yet a mere huddle of uncertainty! the *glory and the scandal* of the universe! (Pascal.)

We shall now proceed to see what are the views of the Christian Church as to the nature of the soul in the brute, to examine how she reconciles the discrepancy between the resurrection of a dead animal and the assumption that its soul dies with it, and to notice some miracles in connection with animals. Before the final and decisive blow is dealt to that selfish doctrine, which has become so pregnant with cruel and merciless practices toward the poor animal world, the reader must be made acquainted with the early hesitations of the Fathers of the Patristic age themselves, as to the right interpretation of the words spoken with reference to that question by St. Paul.

It is amusing to note how the Karma of two of the most indefatigable defenders of the Latin Church—Messrs. Des Mousseaux and De Mirville, in whose works the record of the few miracles here noted are found—led both of them to furnish the weapons now used against their own sincere but very erroneous views.[5]

The great battle of the Future having to be fought out between the "Creationists" or the Christians, as all the believers in a special creation and a personal god, and the Evolutionists or the Hindus, Buddhists,

---

[5] It is but justice to acknowledge here that De Mirville is the first to recognize the error of the Church in this particular and to defend animal life, as far as he dares do so.

all the Free-thinkers and last, though not least, most of the men of science, a recapitulation of their respective positions is advisable.

1. The Christian world postulates its right over animal life: (*a*) on the afore-quoted Biblical texts and the later scholastic interpretations; (*b*) on the assumed absence of anything like divine or human soul in animals. Man survives death, the brute *does not.*

2. The Eastern Evolutionists, basing their deductions upon their great philosophical systems, maintain it is a sin against nature's work and progress to kill any living being—for reasons given in the preceding pages.

3. The Western Evolutionists, armed with the latest discoveries of science, heed neither Christians nor Heathens. Some scientific men believe in Evolution, others do not. They agree, nevertheless, upon one point: namely, that physical, exact research offers no grounds for the presumption that man is endowed with an immortal, divine soul, any more than his dog.

Thus, while the Asiatic Evolutionists behave toward animals consistently with their scientific and religious views, neither the church nor the materialistic school of science is logical in the practical applications of their respective theories. The former, teaching that every living thing is created singly and especially by God, as any human babe may be, and that it finds itself from birth to death under the watchful care of a wise and kind Providence, allows the inferior creation at the same time only a temporary soul. The latter, regarding both man and animal as the soulless production of some hitherto undiscovered forces in nature, yet practically creates an abyss between the two. A man of science, the most determined materialist, one who proceeds to vivisect a living animal with the utmost coolness, would yet shudder at the thought of laming—not to speak of torturing to death—his fellow-man. Nor does one find among those great materialists who were religiously inclined men any who have shown themselves consistent and logical in defining the true moral status of the animal on this earth and the rights of man over it.

Some instances must now be brought to prove the charges stated. Appealing to serious and cultured minds it must be postulated that the views of the various authorities here cited are not unfamiliar to the reader. It will suffice therefore simply to give short epitomes of some of the conclusions arrived at—beginning with the Churchmen.

(*To be concluded.*)

ABOUT KILLING ANIMALS

A correspondent asks. "Will you kindly explain why, if you think it wrong to kill a water bug, that you should consider it right to slay larger animals for food?"

I DO not remember having said it was *wrong* to kill a water bug; hence there is no conclusion to be made from that to the question of feeding on animals, so far as I am concerned.

The questions of right and wrong are somewhat mixed on this subject. If one says it is morally wrong to kill a water bug, then it follows that it is wrong to live at all, inasmuch as in the air we breathe and the water imbibed there are many millions of animals in structure more complicated than bugs. Though these are called *infusoria* and *animalculae,* yet they are living, moving beings as much as are bugs. We draw them in and at once they are destroyed, slain to the last one. Shall we therefore stop living? The whole of life is a battle, a destruction and a compromise as long as we are on this material plane. As human beings we have to keep on living, while in our destructive path millions of beings are hourly put to death. Even by living and earning a living each one of us is preventing some one else from doing the same, who, if we were dead, might step into our shoes. But if we abandoned the fight—were we, indeed, able to do so—then the ends of evolution could not be attained. Hence we have to stay and endure what Karma falls from the necessary deaths we occasion.

So the true position seems to me to be this, that in certain environments, at certain stages of evolution, we have to do an amount of injury to others that we cannot avoid. So while we thus live we must eat, some of flesh and others of the vegetable. Neither class is wholly right or wrong. It becomes a wrong when we deliberately without actual need destroy the lives of animals or insects. So the man who was born in a family and generation of meat-eaters and eats the meat of slaughtered animals does less wrong than the woman who, though a vegetarian, wears the feathers of slaughtered birds in her hats, since it was not necessary to her life that such decoration should be indulged in. So the epicure who tickles his palate with many dishes of meats not necessary

---

NOTE.—This article and the brief "Reflections" following the break, were first printed by Wm. Q. Judge in the *Path* for March, 1892, and February, 1889, respectively. They were last reprinted in THEOSOPHY 3:243-4.

for sustentation is in the same case as the woman who wears bird's feathers. Again as to shoes, saddles, bridles, pocketbooks, and what not, of leather. These are all procured from the skins of slain animals. Shall they be abolished? Are the users of them in the wrong? Any one can answer. Or did we live near the North Pole we would be compelled to live on bears' and wolves' meat and fat. Man, like all material beings, lives at the expense of some others. Even our death is brought about by the defeat of one party of microbes who are devoured by the others, who then themselves turn round and devour each other.

But the real man is a spirit-mind, not destructible nor destroying; and the kingdom of heaven is not of meat nor of drink: it cometh not from eating nor refraining—it cometh of itself.

When I am annoyed by an ungovernable animal, I am reminded that the brutes would not oppose man if man understood and entered into his true relations with all things. The brutes are unconsciously aware of the general human opposition, which they see focalized in each human being. When I am in harmony with all things, men *cannot* and brutes *will not* oppose me. In underrating instinct, the brute is more true than is the man, to the unwritten Law.

The "idle word" condemned by Jesus is inactivity of Being. It is the cessation of the homogeneous resonance, the Logos or Word. The Word in its highest activity is pure spirit; in stagnation it is hell. To each man it is given in trust for all men; if he misinterprets it he is tortured. If he sequestrates it, he is condemned to eternal death that it may be free; for it is eternally free. Through misuse, he may learn its use. If he denies it, he is lost; for by it alone he lives.

It is better for a man to sin deliberately against the Law than to chafe under the mandates of conscience. The first is a renegade who chooses another King; the second is coward and slave who rebels but dares not disobey. The energy of direct sin may, by reaction, compel return, but the lethargy of fear bears no fruit.

If you wish to receive, *give*. If you wish to ascend, *descend*. If you wish to live, *die*. If you wish to understand these words, read them by the lamp of the spirit, and reject that of the understanding.

Apparent evil is a necessary result of manifestation or duality. The good alone is *in Time* inactive. Evil is the balance of good: the Equilibrating power reigns above and is alone eternal.

When the silent Eternal gives birth to the activity of Spirit in Space the worlds are evolved, and, seeking equilibrium, return again to the eternal silence. So with the soul of man.

More saving grace may be found in the society of thieves than in that of fine persons who never reverberate to a true thought. In the first there is rebound; the latter is the negation of life.

Expiation is the kernel of sin. "Evil" containing its own punishment continually defeats itself, and sows the seed of "good" in its own regeneration.

He who would see Perfection must become It. How? By beginning the attempt. Its first step is the full realization of imperfection in himself.

GANDHI'S AND BUDDHA'S "AHIMSA"

I am more than most people endeavoring to popularize the truth for which Gotama Buddha lived and died. . . . I would like to tell the meeting what I believe about Buddhism. To me it is a part of Hinduism. Buddha did not give the world a new religion; he gave it a new interpretation. He taught Hinduism not to take but to give life. . . . It has become the fashion nowadays in some quarters to say that India's downfall dates from her acceptance of Buddha's teachings. It is tantamount to saying that love and pity, if sufficiently practiced, will degrade the world. In other words, according to the critics, evil should triumph in the end. It is my unalterable belief that India has fallen not because it accepted Gotama's teaching, but because it failed to live up to it. The priest has ever sacrificed the prophet. . . . But we need not despair. The reformation that Buddha attempted has never had a fair trial. Twenty-five hundred years are nothing in the life of the world. If the evolution of form takes æons, why should we expect miracles in the evolution of thought and conduct? . . . Religion is to me a living faith in the supreme Unseen Force. That Force has confounded mankind before, and it is bound to confound us again. Buddha taught us to defy appearances and trust in the final triumph of Truth and Love. This was his matchless gift to Hinduism and to the world. He taught us also how to do it, because he lived what he taught.

—MOHANDAS GANDHI

NOTES ON PLATO'S SOCRATES

EMERSON, we recall, is one of the few great writers who understands that Plato's genuine calling is that of education. Both Plato's dialogues and his myths are devices for stirring the intuition and developing the minds of those who contact his writings. Here, again, we see the appropriateness of Plato's selection of Socrates as his spokesman. Socrates, too, lived to educate. Neither Socrates nor Plato was desirous of claiming authority for opinions, and it was Aristotle's authoritative tendency in matters of the intellect which set up the sharp psychological cleavage between the Platonic and Aristotelian traditions. Aristotle was presumptuous enough to believe that he could determine an "absolute truth" on many matters. But both Socrates and Plato knew that the issue of life is not solved by an ambition to discover absolutes—rather by the realization that the only true "absolute" is the never-ending potential of the soul to perceive more truly and widely than previously.

The Eighth Book of *The Republic* closes with a statement of Plato's basic vision as an educator. Socrates has been endeavoring to explain why "certain professors of education" must be wrong when they fancy that they can teach by a process of implanting or indoctrination:

> Our argument shows that the power and capacity of learning exists in the soul already; and that just as the eye was unable to turn from darkness to light without the whole body, so too the instrument of knowledge can only by the movement of the whole soul be turned from the world of becoming into that of being, and learn by degrees to endure the sight of being, and of the brightest and best of being, or in other words, of the good.

Earlier in the Eighth Book Plato has Socrates address himself to the dangers of corruption in philosophy. He states that "the greatest and most lasting injury" is done to philosophy, not by her opponents, but "by her own professing followers." This is because the superificially brilliant intellectual easily becomes enamored of categories and phrasing rather than of the truth. Only that man knows the truth who realizes that truth is an elusive essence, always ahead of him on the path of learning. And this, we may think, from the standpoint of Theosophy, is the true reason for Socrates' professions of "ignorance." To know that one never knows "all," that what men call knowledge is but

temporary approximation of relationship between subject and object, is to guard against conceits and closed-mindedness. So the true philosopher is an educator—of necessity one who constantly seeks to teach himself, and also, therefore, one fitted to be a teacher of his fellows:

> The true lover of knowledge is always striving after being—that is his nature; he will not rest in the multiplicity of individuals which is an appearance only, but will go on—the keen edge will not be blunted, nor the force of his desire abate until he have attained the knowledge of the true nature of every essence by a sympathetic and kindred power in the soul, and by that power drawing near and mingling and becoming incorporate with every being, having begotten mind and truth, he will have knowledge and will live and grow truly, and then, and not till then, will he cease from his travail.

Plato is regarded as authoritarian to the degree that his calling as educator is not recognized. The ideal of "the philosopher-king" seems strange only because we think of kings in terms of authoritative control. But Plato's King serves as does the university president, in ideal also a natural teacher. He rules, not because he wishes to, but because he has been sought by those who need his guidance. Also in Book Eight Plato employs this analogy to establish his point:

> The pilot should not humbly beg the sailors to be commanded by him—that is not the order of nature; neither are "the wise to go to the doors of the rich"—the ingenious author of this saying told a lie —but the truth is, that, when a man is ill, whether he be rich or poor, to the physician he must go, and he who wants to be governed, to him who is able to govern. The ruler who is good for anything ought not to beg his subjects to be ruled by him; although the present governors of mankind are of a different stamp; they may be justly compared to the mutinous sailors, and the true helmsmen to those who are called by them good-for-nothings and star-gazers.

In this context, then, we are perhaps better able to appreciate the famous statement on the "philosopher-king":

> Until philosophers are kings, or the kings and princes of this world have the spirit and power of philosophy, and political greatness and wisdom meet in one, and those commoner natures who pursue either to the exclusion of the other are compelled to stand aside, cities will never have rest from their evils,—no, nor the human race, as I believe, —and then only will this our State have a possibility of life and behold the light of day.

Plato's picture of a republic, as he explains, is a device which should aid men in acquiring a sense of contrast in regard to the society in which they presently live. One may, as Plato puts it, live "as if" he existed in

a city always governed by principles of philosophy, implemented in detail by those who are sought for leadership because their capacity in the discipline of the philosopher is proven the greatest. But Plato does not simply depend upon the weight of reason to perform the work of education. To reach the hearts as well as the minds of men, the imagination must be stirred by that sort of magic which inheres in drama and myth. As Professor Winspear has noted in *The Genesis of Plato's Thought*: "It is metaphysical prejudice which causes the tradition to think of Thales as the first 'philosopher' because he was the first to put into formal and sober prose a traditional cosmological notion. They neglect too much the slow process of informal, poetical speculation about man and society, and particularly the growth of intuitions and profound prophetic utterances about the nature and meaning of justice. Plato's great literary and philosophical masterpiece, *The Republic,* has exercised an incomparable influence over the minds and imaginations of Western man; hardly a century has escaped this influence, direct or indirect." So Plato has Socrates explain that, above the rigors of inductive logic, is the realm of metaphysics, which may be approached in several ways. First in importance is a capacity for imaginative generalization, and Socrates remarks: "I am a great lover of these processes of division and generalization; they help me to speak and think. And if I find any man who is able to see unity and plurality in nature, him I follow, and walk in his step as if he were a god. And those who have this art, I have hitherto been in the habit of calling dialecticians."

When we combine imaginative generalization and metaphysics we arrive at the realm of symbolic literature, which seeks to instruct by indirection. As J. A. Stewart put it in his introduction to *The Myths of Plato*:

> The Platonic Dialogue may be broadly described as a Drama in which speech is the action, and Socrates and his companions are the actors.
>
> But it is only mainly that the Platonic Drama consists in argumentative conversation. It contains another element, the Myth, which, though not ostensibly present in some Dialogues, is so striking in others, some of them the greatest, that we are compelled to regard it, equally with the argumentative conversation, as essential to Plato's philosophical style.

Here, once again, we discover a natural blending of the talents of Socrates and Plato. According to Professor Stewart, the myth is not

only characteristic of Plato, but "is likely to represent some striking trait in the person and influence of the real Socrates." Mr. Stewart continues:

> It is in the mouth of the dramatic Socrates that Plato puts those Myths best fitted to fill us with wondering surmise and make us think —the so-called Eschatological Myths. It may be that here Plato represents a trait of the real Socrates. Socrates' method of argumentative conversation, it is fully recognized, determined the dialogue-form of the Platonic writings. It may be that also the introduction of Myths, at least of the Eschatological Myths—Myths distinguished by great impressiveness of matter and style—was suggested to Plato by something in the real Socrates.

Plato spoke a universal language because he was a universal educator, knowing something of the value of all methods of instruction, and possessing a genius for synthesizing the value in a fashion which conveys that sense of drama which awakens further perception in the soul. Professor Koyre, in his *Discovering Plato,* sums up Plato's function as a philosopher-educator:

> The philosopher's role likewise stands out in bold relief. What he must do, or at least attempt, is to educate the city, that is, to educate its elite, to give them or return to them respect for true values, love of justice, devotion to the city, respect for law; to go on with what Socrates began, to accomplish the mission to which Plato devoted his life.
>
> Democracy, as we have seen, is a system where anything, or almost anything, can happen. The worst, but also the best. In it one may encounter all types: the sophist and also the philosopher. That is the unique advantage of this way of life, an advantage which in Plato's eyes is enormous and that imposes upon the philosopher his role and his place in the combat.

THE TEACHER

What actually occurs in teaching is not a transfer of information or ideas but an interchange of *words,* the effect of which is not to deposit ideas in the learner's mind but rather to fertilize and bring to life potential ideas already existing there. The teacher's function is neither to fill heads nor to shape characters, but to release.

—W. KENNETH RICHMOND

COUNTERACTING KARMA

THE problem of counteracting the baleful effects of wrong Karmic causation is of especial concern to those who have entered within the area of the Theosophical Movement. Such have had at least a partial vision of "the path which is not manifest," which means that instead of relying upon external moral codes and sanctions, they have awakened to a realization that evolution is in their own hands, that it depends on self-induced and self-devised efforts. As declared by Krishna in the twelfth chapter of the *Bhagavad-Gita*: "For those whose hearts are fixed on the unmanifested the labor is greater, because the path which is not manifest is with difficulty attained by corporeal beings." The labor is greater because the devotee has loosened his attachment to his former props and moorings—the "thou shalt or thou shalt not do thus and so" of formal codes, whether religious or secular. These codes, after all, are really systems of rewards and punishments, and the follower of "the path not manifest" strives to rise above this pair of opposites, seeking to evaluate all action so as to transmute seeming evil into power for good.

The conversion of apparent evil into a power for good is accomplished by replacing *egoistic* action by action which is motivated by consideration for others, or *altruistic* action. This is the essence of all ways to counteract and mitigate the baneful effects of wrong causation. Aphorism 13, of W.Q.J.'s "Aphorisms on Karma" pertains directly to our subject: "The effects may be counteracted or mitigated by the thoughts and acts of oneself or of another, and then the resulting effects represent the combination and interaction of the whole number of causes involved in producing the effects." This power to counteract Karmic effects by the thoughts and acts of oneself or of another is due to the essential unity and interdependence of Humanity.

As H.P.B. wrote in *The Key to Theosophy* (p. 203): "It is an occult law, moreover, that no man can rise superior to his individual failings, without lifting, be it ever so little, the whole body of which he is an integral part. In the same way, no man can sin, nor suffer the effects of sin, alone. In reality, there is no such thing as 'Separateness'; and the nearest approach to that selfish state, which the laws of life permit, is in the intent or motive." Rising superior to one's individual failings means the recognition and removal of the *causes* of these failings, and

such causes exist on the planes of mind and desire, for thought is the real plane of action. It is stated on page 644 of Volume I of *The Secret Doctrine* that "The suppression of one single bad *cause* will suppress not one but a variety of bad effects." The principle underlying this is thus expressed on the same page of *The Secret Doctrine*: "It is a law of occult dynamics that 'a given amount of energy expended on the spiritual or astral plane is productive of far greater results than the same amount expended on the physical objective plane of existence'." This *Secret Doctrine* statement of the law of occult dynamics, together with some additional and correlative statements, gives us a deeper insight into the way that Karmic effects may be counteracted and transmuted.

In his article, *Occultism: What Is It?* Mr. Judge wrote: "The Masters of Occultism state that a law of 'transmutation among forces' prevails forever. . . . Modern science admits the existence of this law as the correlation of forces. It is felt in the moral sphere of our being as well as in the physical world, and causes remarkable changes in a man's character and circumstances quite beyond us at present and altogether unknown to science and metaphysics." The fact that the transmutation among forces is felt in the moral sphere of being as well as in the physical world has a direct bearing on the power to modify Karmic effects by generating a counteracting force or cause. In this light Krishna's words and promise in the fourth chapter of *The Bhagavad-Gita* acquire new meaning. "Even if thou wert the greatest of all sinners, thou shalt be able to cross over all sins in the bark of spiritual knowledge. As the natural fire, O Arjuna, reduceth fuel to ashes, so does the fire of knowledge reduce all actions to ashes. There is no purifier in the world to be compared to spiritual knowledge; and he who is perfected in devotion findeth spiritual knowledge springing up spontaneously in himself in the progress of time."

As it is a poor rule that does not work both ways, the opposite phase of the operation of the law of transmutation among forces is contained in this *Voice of the Silence* Precept: "For, on Path fourth, the lightest breeze of passion or desire will stir the steady light upon the pure white walls of Soul. The smallest wave of longing or regret for Maya's gifts illusive, along Antaskarana—the path that lies between thy Spirit and thy self, the highway of sensations, the rude arousers of Ahankara—a thought as fleeting as the lightning flash will make thee thy three prizes forfeit—the prizes thou hast won." "A thought as fleeting as the light-

ning flash" is a graphic illustration of the creative, destructive, and transforming power of thought-energy.

Modern science has discovered the correlation of forces on the physical plane alone, and it has not as yet squarely recognized the existence of other planes; occult science, and especially that branch once called alchemy, deals with the transmutation among forces on all the planes of the septenary cosmos, as well as those of man, the copy and epitome of the Greater Whole. It was man and his moral progress that alchemy had in view in its object of transmuting gross metal into gold. This is borne out by a passage in the Theosophical Glossary under Alchemy:

> What that gold, however, really is, very few people understand correctly. No doubt that there is such a thing in nature as transmutation of the base metals into the nobler, or gold. But this is only one aspect of alchemy, the terrestrial or purely material, for we sense logically the same process taking place in the bowels of the earth. Yet, besides and beyond this interpretation, there is in alchemy a symbolical meaning, purely psychic and spiritual. While the Kabbalist-Alchemist seeks for the realization of the former, the Occultist-Alchemist, spurning the gold of the mines, gives all his attention and directs his efforts only towards the transmutation of the baser *quaternary* into the divine upper *trinity* of man, which when finally blended are one.

The occult maxim, "As above so below," establishes a correspondence between moral and physical forces and correlations. The "above" is really the *within* or subjective, and the "below," the *without* or objective. As "the Universe is worked and *guided* from *within* outwards," and as "every *external* motion, act, gesture, whether voluntary or mechanical, organic or mental, is produced and preceded by *internal* feeling or emotion, will or volition, and thought or mind," then it follows that moral and spiritual forces *precede* and are the *causes* of the physically perceived forces. The relationship between the two is as cause to effect. The outer and visible force correlations and their *qualities, i.e.,* whether constructive and beneficent, or destructive and maleficent, are the Karmic consequences of the mental and moral forces generated by those whose wills are free to do so—human beings of every degree of responsibility. An application of this occult tenet to universal cataclysms is set forth in *S.D.* I, 640:

> For these forces [the ordinary and known physical forces] were but the tools and final means for the accomplishment of certain purposes acting periodically, and apparently mechanically, through an

> inward impulse mixed up with, but beyond their material nature. There is a purpose in every important act in Nature, whose acts are all cyclic and periodical. But spiritual forces having been usually confused with the purely physical, the former are denied by, and therefore, have remained unknown to Science, because left unexamined.

On page 120 of the *Ocean of Theosophy,* the same idea is thus expressed: "Man is a great dynamo, making, storing and throwing out energy, and when masses of men composing a race thus make and distribute energy, there is a resulting dynamic effect on the material of the globe which will be powerful enough to be distinct and cataclysmic."

THE "MORAL KERNEL"

No "personality"—a mere bundle of material atoms and of instinctual and mental characteristics—can of course continue, as such, in the world of pure Spirit. Only that which is immortal in its very nature and divine in its essence, namely, the Ego, can exist for ever. And as it is that Ego which chooses the personality it will inform, after each Devachan, and which receives through these personalities the effects of the Karmic causes produced, it is therefore the Ego, that *self* which is the "moral kernel" referred to and embodied karma, "which alone survives death."

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

THE SHAPE OF DEITY

ACCORDING to the Hindu teaching, Deity *in the shape of Æther* (*Akasa*) pervades all things. It was called therefore by the theurgists "the living fire," the "Spirit of Light," and sometimes *Magnes.* It was the highest Deity itself which, according to Plato, built the Universe in the *geometrical form* of the Dodecahedron.

What does the modern science of physics know of Æther, the first concept of which belongs undeniably to ancient philosophers, the Greeks having borrowed it from the Aryans, and the origin of modern Æther being found in, and disfigured from Akasa? We put forward the Occult teaching which maintains the reality of a super-substantial and supersensible essence of that Akasa (not Ether, which is only an aspect of the latter), the nature of which cannot be inferred from its remoter manifestations—*its merely phenomenal phalanx of effects* on this terrene plane. Ether is the grossest form of Akasa, the fifth universal Cosmic Principle, to which corresponds and from which proceeds human *Manas.* Akasa is the subtle, supersensuous spiritual essence which pervades all space, the primordial substance erroneously identified with Ether. It is to Ether what Spirit is to matter, or Atma to Kamarupa.

If the student bears in mind that there is but One Universal Element, which is infinite, unborn, and undying, and that all the rest—as in the world of phenomena—are but so many various differentiated aspects and transformations (correlations) of that One; from Cosmical down to micro-cosmical effects, from super-human down to human and sub-human beings—the totality, in short, of objective existence; if the student bears this in mind, then the first and chief difficulty will disappear and Occult Cosmology may be mastered.

Akasa is the Universal Space in which lies inherent the eternal Ideation of the Universe in its ever-changing aspects on the planes of matter and objectivity. On account of the Essence of Æther (Akasa), or the Unseen Space, being held divine as the supposed *veil of Deity,* it was regarded as the medium between this life and the next one. The ancients considered that when the directing active "Intelligences" (the gods) retired from any portion of Ether *in our Space*—the four realms which they superintended—then that particular place was left in the

---

NOTE.—Collated from *The Secret Doctrine.*

possession of Evil, so called by reason of the absence of the *Good* from it. For Ether is the Astral Light; and Primordial Substance is Akasa, the *Upadhi* [vehicle and "shape"] of Divine Thought. The astral light stands in the same relation to Akasa and *Anima Mundi,* as Satan stands to the Deity. They are one and the same thing *seen from two aspects*: the spiritual and the psychic—the super-ethereal or connecting link between matter and pure spirit, and the physical.

Akasa is the synthesis of all the forces in Nature. From Akasa radiates the First Logos, or expressed Thought. After Pralaya, whether the great or the minor Pralaya, the first that reawakes to active life is the plastic Akasa, Father-Mother, the Spirit and Soul of Ether. It is a radiant, cool, diathermanous plastic matter, creative in its *physical* nature, correlative in its *grossest aspects* and portions, immutable in its *higher principles.* In its higher aspect it is the Soul of the World; in its lower —the Destroyer. In the former condition it is called the *Sub*-Root; and in conjunction with radiant heat, it recalls "dead worlds to life." *Root*-Nature is the source of the subtile invisible properties in visible matter. It is the Soul, so to say, of the One invisible Spirit. The Hindus call it Mulaprakriti (the Root of Nature), and say that it is the primordial substance which is the *basis* of the Upadhi or vehicle of every phenomenon, whether physical, mental or psychic. It is the source from which Akasa radiates.

This Primordial Substance is called by some *Chaos.* Plato and Pythagoras named it the Soul of the World *after* it had been impregnated by the Spirit of *That* which broods over the Primeval Waters, or *Chaos.* It is by being reflected in it, say the Kabalists, that the brooding Principle created the phantasmagoria of a visible, manifested Universe. *Chaos,* before—*Ether,* after, the "reflection"; it is *still the Deity* that pervades all Space and things. It is the invisible, imponderable Spirit of all things and the invisible, but too tangible fluid that radiates from the fingers of the healthy magnetizer, for it is Vital Electricity—Life itself. What is primordial Chaos but Æther (Akasa)? Not the *modern* Ether; not such as is recognized now, but such as *was* known to the ancient philosophers long before the time of Moses: Æther, with all its mysterious and occult properties, containing in itself the germs of universal creation. *Upper* Æther or Akasa is the celestial virgin and mother of every existing form and being, from whose bosom, as soon as "incubated" by the Divine Spirit, are called into existence Matter and Life, Force and Action. Æther is the *Aditi* of the Hindus, and it is Akasa. Electricity,

magnetism, heat, light, and chemical action are so little understood even now that fresh facts are constantly widening the range of our knowledge. Who knows where ends the power of this protean Giant—Æther; or whence its mysterious origin? Who, we mean, that denies the spirit that works in it, and evolves out of it all visible forms?

From the Unknown One, the Infinite Totality, the manifested One, or the periodical, Manvantaric *Deity,* emanates. And this is the Universal Mind, which, separated from its Fountain-Source, is the Demiurgos or the creative Logos of the Western Kabalists, and the four-faced Brahmâ of the Hindu religion. In its totality, viewed from the standpoint of the manifested Divine Thought in the esoteric doctrine, it represents the Hosts of the higher creative Dhyan Chohans. Simultaneously with the evolution of the Universal Mind, the concealed Wisdom of Adi-Buddha—the One Supreme and eternal—manifests itself as Avalokiteswara (or manifested Iswara). The latter is the Osiris of the Egyptians, the Ahura-Mazda of the Zoroastrians, the Heavenly Man of the Hermetic philosophers, the Logos of the Platonists, and the Atman of the Vedantins. By the action of the manifested Wisdom, or Mahat, represented by these innumerable centers of spiritual energy in the Kosmos—the reflection of the Universal Mind which is Cosmic Ideation and the intellectual Force accompanying such ideation, becomes objectively the Fohat of the Buddhist esoteric philosophers. Fohat, sets in motion the law of Cosmic Evolution, which brings into existence all the various states of being in the manifested Solar System.

Fohat is the "Son of Ether" in its highest aspect, Akasa, the Mother-Father of the primitive Seven, and of *Sound* or Logos. Fohat is the *light* of the latter. All the Kabalists and Occultists, Eastern and Western, recognize (a) the identity of "Father-Mother" with primordial Æther or Akasa; and (b) its homogeneity before the evolution of the "Son," cosmically *Fohat,* for it is Cosmic Electricity. If the Dhyan Chohans and all the invisible Beings—the Seven Centers and their direct Emanations, the minor centers of Energy—are the direct reflex of the One Light, yet men are far removed from these, since the whole of the *visible* Kosmos consists of *"self-produced"* beings, the creatures of Karma. And it will be only in the next, or Fifth, Round that the fifth Element, Ether—the gross body of Akasa, if it can be called even that—will by becoming a familiar fact of Nature to all men, as air is familiar to us now, cease to be as at present hypothetical, and also an "Agent" for so many things. And only during that Round will those higher

senses, the growth and development of which Akasa subserves, be susceptible of a complete expansion.

The whole range of physical phenomena proceed from the *Primary* of Ether—Akasa, as dual-natured Akasa proceeds from undifferentiated Chaos, so-called; the latter being the primary *aspect* of Mulaprakriti, the root-matter, and the first abstract Idea one can form of Parabrahman. Science may divide its hypothetically conceived ether in as many ways as she likes; the *real* Æther or Space will remain as it is throughout. It has its seven principles, as all the rest of Nature has, and where there was no Ether *there would be no sound,* as it is the vibrating sound-board in nature in all of its seven differentiations. This is the first mystery the Initiates of old have learned. Our present normal physical senses were (from our present point of view) abnormal in those days of slow and progressive downward evolution and fall into matter. And there was a day when all that which in our modern times is regarded as phenomena, so puzzling to the physiologists now compelled to believe in them —such as thought transference, clairvoyance, clairaudience, etc.: in short, all that which is called now "wonderful and abnormal"—all that and much more belonged to the senses and faculties common to all humanity.

Æther (Akasa), in Esotericism, is the very quintessence of all possible energy, and it is certainly to this universal agent (composed of many *agents*) that all the manifestations of energy in the material, psychic and spiritual worlds are due. We are, however, cycling back and cycling forward, i.e., having lost in spirituality that which we acquired in physical development until almost the end of the Fourth Race, we (mankind) are as gradually and imperceptibly losing now in the physical all that we regain once more in the spiritual re-evolution. This process must go on until the period which will bring the Sixth Root-Race on a parallel line with the spirituality of the Second, long extinct mankind.

No doubt Occult philosophy could learn a good deal from exact modern science. But the latter, on the other hand, might profit by ancient learning in more than one way, and chiefly in Cosmogony. For instance, the mystical signification, alchemical and transcendental, of the many imponderable substances that fill inter-planetary space, and which, interpenetrating each, are the direct cause, at the lower end, of the production of natural phenomena manifesting through *vibration* (so-called). This knowledge of the *real* (not the hypothetical) nature of Ether, or rather of the Akasa, and other mysteries, in short, can alone

lead to the knowledge of Forces. It is that *substance* against which the materialistic school of the physicists rebels with such fury, and which exact Science has to advocate notwithstanding. They cannot make away with it without incurring the risk, like a modern Samson, of pulling down the pillars of the Temple of Science, and getting buried under its roof.

If it is admitted that the perfect harmony of the stars and planets and the coincidence of their orbital planes prove the existence of a natural cause, which would thus be the primal cause, "that cause cannot really be the matter which fills today the heavenly space." It must be that which filled space—was space—originally; whose motion in differentiated matter was the origin of the actual movements of the sidereal bodies; and which, "in condensing itself in those very bodies, thus abandoned the space that is found void today" (Kant). In other words, it is that same matter of which are now composed the planets, comets, and the Sun himself, which, having in the origin formed itself into those bodies, has preserved its inherent quality of motion; which quality, now centered in their nuclei, directs all motion. A very slight alteration of words is needed, and a few additions, to make of this our Esoteric Doctrine.

The latter teaches that it is this original primordial *prima materia,* divine and intelligent, the direct emanation of the Universal Mind—the *Daiviprakriti* (the divine light emanating from the *Logos*)—which formed the nuclei of all the "self-moving" orbs in Kosmos. It is the informing, ever-present moving-power and life-principle, the vital soul of the suns, moons, planets, and even of our Earth. The former latent; the last one active—the invisible Ruler and guide of the gross body attached to, and connected with, its Soul, which is the spiritual emanation, after all, of these respective planetary Spirits—the Dhyan Chohans.

Thus, "Deity in the shape of Akasa pervades all things." The Buddhists, regarding a personal God "as only a gigantic shadow thrown upon the void of space by the imagination of ignorant men," teach that only "two things are (objectively) eternal, namely Akasa and Nirvana; and that these are One in reality, and but a maya when divided." Buddhists deny creation and cannot conceive of a Creator. "Everything has come out of Akasa (or *Svabhavat* on our earth) in obedience to a law of motion inherent in it, and after a certain existence passes away. Nothing ever came out of nothing." (*Buddhist Catechism.*)

THE PRESSURE OF ADVERSE THOUGHT

IT is a manifestation of natural law which causes the student of Theosophy to realize that the more he attempts to live the theosophical life, the more obstacles he encounters. If his feet are planted in the stream of daily human efforts, he feels the current pressing against them. If, more dedicated, he plunges into the stream and tries to swim against the current, the pressure may sweep him away unless he finds something to cling to.

Let us examine some of the pressures with which the student has to contend. He lives among people who do not think as he thinks; he is surrounded by many who do not see what he sees; who do not hear what he hears; whose motives are not his motives; whose reactions to current events differ from his; whose gods are not his gods; and whose mores and manners are so crystallized that his daily associates have become intolerant of all who do not think and act as they themselves do.

Nevertheless, the student knows he is where he is, and is what he is, because of karmic law—a result of his own connection with persons, things, and circumstances in past and present. He may be affected by the pressure of thought of his worldly companions who ignore the principles of Life, Law, and Evolution, but to the extent that he can bear the pressure, he will be the better able to help and teach others—and himself.

There exist among our people many agencies for the gathering and dissemination of "news." Also, we have many analysts and commentators who try to dissect the news items and give the meanings in terms of their own opinions. There are many readers and listeners who accept news items as published, without question, or who are affected by the commentators' views, but few there are who try to look for the occult meaning in the circumstances which are reported to them. The student of Theosophy does, however, look for such meanings, and, where he finds that the commentators' statements agree with the expositions of natural law which the student has learned to recognize, he can point out that fact to others and perhaps stimulate inquiry. Where he finds a meaning in the commentators' remarks which indicates a bias he may be in position to point out some errors. If he can justify the position he

takes in such matters, and avoid controversy and argument, he may encourage his associates to think for themselves.

It is in matters of current events and trends, as well as history, that most of the pressure of adverse thought is felt, although it may also be noted in personal behavior. Therefore impersonality in expressing one's thoughts is very much in order. The Theosophist is neither a missionary nor crusader, and a supposed "Theosophical" bias is just as unworthy as any other bias. The crusader may intone "The Bible says," and insist that what the Bible says must be accepted as true. The Theosophist may state, "Theosophy teaches thus and so," but he may not insist that what Theosophy teaches must be believed, even though he has learned from his own experience that it is true. He had to *learn* what he knows, and he very likely commenced the process of learning by unbelief or even disbelief.

One phase of the pressure of adverse thought is that of authority. Many writers and reporters are reputed to be, or accredited as, authorities in such fields as commerce, health, history, foreign relations, military matters, etc., and many such are no doubt technically qualified to express their opinions on such matters. When we reach the point where we can separate facts and opinions, the question of authority will no longer bother us; in fact, many of us received our training along these lines by learning to separate the teachings of Theosophy from the claims of authority made by various exponents.

Where we agree with a reporter's views, we feel no pressure, but where we disagree, we cannot do so on our own authority. We do, nevertheless, have as much right to express our views as does any writer or reporter, and probably more justification if the opinions of a reporter are slanted by editorial or corporate policy in matters of politics, religion, or personal interests.

The late Will Rogers once described advertising as that form of magic which makes people spend money they haven't got for things they don't want. There may be pressure in advertising, as there is in most forms of propaganda, but there need be no compulsion unless we allow ourselves to be compelled. Many people measure the value of a product, a treatment, a public movement or a system of thought by its *popularity*, not having the means of knowing that, in this Kali Yuga, many times minority opinions are the only true ones. If the teachings of Theosophy were to be evaluated on the basis of popularity, their value would be con-

sidered almost nil. But, let us remember that few great reform movements were ever popular in the beginning, simply because their ideas clashed with those of the populace who preferred the easy and irresponsible way to the true and difficult.

What is the student of Theosophy to do when he feels the pressure of adverse thought, or is in danger of being affected by it? If he places himself in violent opposition to popular but erroneous ideas, he is offering himself as a target for derision, suspicion, and even persecution, and, more important, usually has little chance of getting a hearing for his ideas. By such opposition he separates himself from all who do not agree with him. True, he is already separated, ideatively, by reason of the thoughts he holds, but he can never consider himself truly apart from those with whom he is one in Universal Life. So, he eases the pressure by searching for the Common Ground, and finds that, in many cases, the Common Ground is the Ideal.

Many sincere people try to find the expression of their ideals in popular religions, movements, or systems of thought, and their very devotion lifts them above the errors of the cults they follow and paves the way for them to find the truth in Theosophy, in the present life or a later one. Except for those who come directly into Theosophy in the present incarnation, there are many who enter by various paths from sects, organizations, and societies which could not give their ideals the full expression found in Theosophy. Just ask each one of a score or more of Theosophists, "What were you before you became a Theosophist?" The answers will be enlightening.

It is not to be thought that all who follow popular movements are motivated by ideals; in fact, the pressure of adverse thought which we notice comes mainly from those who lack ideals. Still, even among those there is the common ground of Basic Identity, and we may know that karma, in the course of time and experience, will bring ideals to those who now lack them.

We learn to discriminate by applying the theosophical yardstick to the evaluation of persons, things and ideas. One of our teachers has indicated that we recognize certain qualities in others only by reason of the existence of such qualities in ourselves. There might be a hint in this for those of us who allow ourselves to feel the pressure of adverse thought too strongly.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

THE idea of impersonality within the framework of the United Lodge of Theosophists is expressed throughout the Declaration; for example, "That work and that end is dissemination of the fundamental principles of the philosophy of Theosophy." It has been the practice of ULT to maintain anonymity in regard to all who speak from the platform, contribute to the magazine, etc. The wisdom of this attitude and practice is obvious when viewed in the light of the Declaration, yet to be so absolute about this practice seems at times ridiculous. We do not often work directly with ideas; and we contact thoughts through persons to whom we are drawn, because we are not by nature completely "impersonal." Is it not sometimes going overboard to insist upon this anonymity?

(*a*) Impersonality has an important function in the working of ULT because the prime focus of attention must then remain on the ideas which Theosophy has to present. Also, emphasis on impersonality encourages students to consider themselves as sharers in an important work, rather than holders of status or position. In this atmosphere, one gains in learning and effectiveness; one can be said to be doing the right thing for the right reason. ULT's members pretty much take for granted the need for impersonality in the Lodge; and it is interesting to note that the Theosophical Society has recently begun to emphasize this attitude more: there is less talk of the prominent theosophical personalities of today, and more of H. P. B. Impersonality is a practical method of operating for the Lodge; how much is "too much" is hard to determine. Where could one start to "personalize" without endangering the purposes of the Declaration?

The most serious danger of impersonality in ULT is that it is hard to tell where it leaves off. Many people cannot easily tell when "pure" teachings are colored by personal interpretations, either on the platform or in the magazine. If people tend to assume that perfect impersonality is in fact the keynote of Lodge activities, they may not attempt to distinguish personal biases. Yet it is important here, as always, to affirm that a good idea is a good idea no matter who says it. But it is also true that students at ULT should not delude themselves into thinking that personalities are *not* represented to some degree, wherever

they turn. And because the coins of ideas are reminted everytime they are formulated, it is well for these students to follow the now standard suggestion that they read and study for themselves the theosophical source-books. That is not the final and only answer to this problem; but it is worth a great deal to the student if he just makes the serious attempt to distinguish for his own information individual points of view as they color another's presentation. It looks as if we have ended up by recommending more impersonality as well as less.

(*b*) "The soul is the Perceiver; is assuredly vision itself pure and simple; unmodified; and looks directly upon ideas" (Patanjali's *Yoga Aphorisms*). However, since the soul requires a vehicle through which to operate and contact on this plane of existence; and since the nature of this "vehicle"—that is, the body and the psychic nature—is so enmeshed in the dense material world, this looking "directly upon ideas" by the soul is not only difficult to come by, but rarely achieved. Since the area of present existence *is* this gross plane, and the real portion of man is that which is invisible and metaphysical, the problem is to enable the soul to express itself more than just rarely—to tune the vehicle to the point where it will transmit and perceive pure ideas.

It is far too easy for us to think of words or a person or a particularly favorite formulation of ideas as being that which is "real" rather than as an inadequate container. So even though we constantly work through the psychic nature, and could not do without its connecting threads, the practice of anonymity seems quite in keeping.

The human being possesses a great storehouse of energy; unfortunately, however, this energy is expended in various diverse directions. The U.L.T. provides a focus for students to *independently* concentrate—focus their energies along lines which they feel are in accord with Theosophical ideas and philosophy. One who is engaged in such an undertaking is not interested in "side issues," politics of organization, announcement of names, signatures, etc. If this sort of practice were initiated, for one thing, it would demand a certain amount of attention and energy which would, later on, as history has shown again and again, become focused on the organizational and political aspects and the "ideas of the philosophy of Theosophy, pure and simple" would fall way back into the background.

There have been many "brotherhoods," religious groups, cooperative houses, which have united in order to promulgate what they felt

to be truths. But the ones which apparently endured the longest and seemed the strongest were those which were in the atmosphere of a strong religious faith or code. The U. L. T. has no "group" morals to which its members may cling nor any ethical code laid out; morals and ethics are present, intrinsically, but each one finds his own particular way of embodying them. The U. L. T.'s "religious" bond, its strength of a mystic nature and its metaphysical conceptions are far too far-reaching to be adequately represented by a little group, or even a large one. The devotional bond existing among students of Theosophy is devotion not to any existing form or particular personality, or any present vehicle for these truths, but rather is that of an independent devotion to the principles of the philosophy of Theosophy.

If the "personal" feeling, which must have expression somewhere since it is a part of man himself, were to intrude much in Theosophical association not only would it detract energy and insight from the study of Theosophy but would also do away with the continual teacher-pupil, pupil-teacher relationship which is in communal motion among the students. If the status, name or position of a mutual seeker and student is not thought about then it is more likely the conception of companions, adventurers on this road of understanding and discipline, will come to mind. When in this position, we are able to learn from others and in turn, teach them—from the honest individuality of our own natures.

In any natural, truly educational school or group (going back as far as Plato's Academy and Ammonius Saccas' School), we do not find emphasis upon, nor do *we* think about, the political status of the teachers. It is the intention and duty of U.L.T. to notice and understand, in theosophical light, all efforts throughout the world which represent "thought struggling to be free." U.L.T. does not wish to "sit tight" with a presumed secret knowledge of life, but instead intends to see that books containing theosophic ideas are made available, and are related, insofar as possible, to varied searchings for truth. This sort of effort requires an awareness of the principles and attitudes of a philosopher, a determination to recognize a "truth," no matter what its garment. Thus, we can see the benefit in starting out, in the circumference of U.L.T., on an impersonal, "principle" basis.

KNOWLEDGE OR BELIEF — WHICH SHALL IT BE?

EXPERIENCE seems to indicate that there are two kinds of Theosophists, so-called, in the world: *revelational* and *inspirational.* The former are mere believers; the latter, knowers, at least in some degree. Among the believers are those who suppose that by signing a membership card in some society or association, they thereby automatically become Theosophists; the "knowers" visualize this step as only one in a long journey that leads out of sight up the Mount of Spiritual Knowledge.

It is not possible to become an *inspirational* Theosophist without a measure of what H. P. Blavatsky has called the "higher intuition." "A theosophist," according to the definition of the English occultist Thomas Vaughan, "is one who gives you a theory of God or the works of God which has not revelation, but an inspiration of his own for its basis." From this point of view, knowledge is seen to be something internal, not external. How, then, can one person tell another what Theosophy, or Truth, really is? The most comprehensive definition one person may receive from another would be only an external one, and would in no sense be based upon "an inspiration of his own." Is it not rather through the exercise and development of one's own individual faculties that each must come to see for himself what Theosophy is? In this case, the definition each makes to himself would be the result of his own growing intuitions, and would be first-hand knowledge.

Of what use, then, are the recorded writings of the Teachers? Are they a hindrance or a help? They may be either, depending upon the attitude with which they are approached. If looked upon as "revelation" from Higher Beings who *know,* to Lower Beings who cannot know but who must believe, then they become a hindrance. But if the message of Theosophy serves to awaken and inspire, if the teachings are looked upon, not as *finalities,* but as ladders by which to climb to greater heights of knowledge, then they become invaluable aids to interior development. All the ancient Theosophists, those of India, Greece and Egypt, as well as of the early Christian and Jewish sects, were, first and foremost, *knowers.* They were men and women with inspirations of their own, who had succeeded in lifting their consciousness beyond the world of form and dogmatism, and who thus challenged the mysteries of the formless Spirit.

ON THE LOOKOUT

"World Perspectives"—and Dr. Fromm

Erich Fromm's *The Art of Loving,* written for the "World Perspectives" series (Harper, 1957), affords Dr. Fromm opportunity to synthesize many of the themes which characterize his earlier works. While the word "love" is suspect of much misunderstanding, it is Dr. Fromm's intent to show that ideal human relationships cannot be separated from the highest philosophical problems.

The discovery of self—which ultimately means awareness of those aspects of selfhood which promise a continuing evolution—is causal to the development of a capacity to love, to respect, to fully appreciate other human beings as significant selves in their own right. As Dr. Fromm puts it, "the longing to know ourselves and to know our fellow man has been expressed in the Delphic motto 'Know thyself.' It is the mainspring of all psychology. But inasmuch as the desire is to know all of man, his innermost secret, the desire can never be fulfilled in knowledge of the ordinary kind, in knowledge only by thought. Even if we knew a thousand times more of ourselves, we would never reach bottom. We would still remain an enigma to ourselves, as our fellow man would remain an enigma to us."

"A Core in Our Personality"

After demonstrating that satisfying love in interpersonal relations is impossible for any person who has not first become disciplined and patient, Dr. Fromm indicates that the crux of the matter lies in respect for one's own continuing identity:

> We are aware of the existence of a self, or a core in our personality which is unchangeable and which persists throughout our life in spite of varying circumstances, and regardless of certain changes in opinions and feelings. It is this core which is the reality behind the word "I", and on which our conviction of our own identity is based. Unless we have faith in the persistence of our self, our feeling of identity is threatened and we become dependent on other people whose approval then becomes the basis for our feeling of identity. Only the person who has faith in himself is able to be faithful to others, because only he can be sure that he will be the same at a future time as he is today and, therefore, that he will feel and act as he now expects to. Faith

> in oneself is a condition of our ability to promise, and since, as Nietzsche said, man can be defined by his capacity to promise, faith is one of the conditions of human existence.

FAITH, "LOVE" AND JUDGMENT

There is a relationship between intuition, conscience and one's "capacity to love," for it is by intuition that we are able to appreciate that certain fundamental *attitudes* represent truth more surely than anything else. We apprehend principle, not simply as a sequence to the disciplined operation of reason, but from feeling an identity with that principle. If that principle illuminates our own life, and if we can recognize that others feel a similar identity with the same principle—or attitude—we may grow into conscious realization of a bond of "metaphysical" union. Dr. Fromm writes:

> Thought and judgment are not the only realm of experience in which rational faith is manifested. In the sphere of human relations, faith is an indispensable quality of any significant friendship or love. "Having faith" in another person means to be certain of the reliability and unchangeability of his fundamental attitudes, of the core of his personality, of his love. By this I do not mean that a person may not change his opinions, but that his basic motivations remain the same; that, for instance, his respect for life and human dignity is part of himself, not subject to change.

THE "WORLD PERSPECTIVES" PROJECT

The Editorial Board of "World Perspectives" has taken on a monumental educational task, strongly reminiscent of two of the three objects of the Theosophical Movement. Ruth Nanda Anshen, who contributes a brief and always inspiring foreword to each volume, concludes her prefatory remarks to Dr. Fromm's book with the following paragraph:

> In spite of the infinite obligation of men and in spite of their finite power, in spite of the intransigence of nationalisms, and in spite of spiritual bereavement and moral amnesia, beneath the apparent turmoil and upheaval of the present, and out of the transformations of this dynamic period with the unfolding of a world-consciousness, the purpose of *World Perspectives* is to help quicken the "unshaken heart of well-rounded truth" and interpret the significant elements of the World Age now taking shape out of the core of that undimmed continuity of the creative process which restores man to mankind while deepening and enhancing his communion with the universe.

Other "World Perspectives" volumes include Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan's *Recovery of Faith* and Lewis Mumford's *Transformations of Man.*

The remarkable synthesis of philosophical, metaphysical, and psychological insights afforded by the series may achieve much in expanding still limited conceptions of "God"—and of man.

Against Nuclear Tests

Hugh Gaitskell, Labor leader of Great Britain, "demanded today that Britain and the United States follow the example of the Soviet Union in suspending nuclear tests." (New York *Times,* April 14.) The deadlock between East and West, Mr. Gaitskell asserted, "had to be broken somehow, and a halt in tests would stop further progress in development of new nuclear weapons, and at least end the race in nuclear weapons." Mr. Gaitskell further declared:

> If you believe that the Russians are only trying to make propaganda, the answer is not to refuse to talk but to talk and bring forward serious proposals for peace and test the sincerity of the Russians.
>
> If it is not propaganda—and I believe myself it is not all propaganda—then no Western government dare refuse the opportunity that exists for coming to terms and reaching a possible settlement.

Death Penalty Abolished

There must be some connection between Great Britain's recent restriction of the death penalty, reported in THEOSOPHY 44:377, and increase of anti-war sentiment in Britain. Again, perhaps, we in America will be able to learn from the obviously greater maturity represented by Englishmen in public office. According to the New York *Herald Tribune,* April 4:

> Delaware became the seventh state to abolish the death penalty. Gov. J. Caleb Boggs signed the bill, which was introduced in the State Legislature April 4, 1955. It has been eleven years since Delaware's last execution.

An Outspoken Scientist

Dr. Linus Carl Pauling, winner of the Nobel Prize in Chemistry in 1954, is presently "suing for an injunction to stop further nuclear tests by this country in the latest in a long series of efforts by him to focus international attention on the nature of nuclear warfare and tests." According to the New York *Times* (April 5):

> Dr. Pauling is as outspoken in his beliefs as he is soft spoken in conversation. In no way is he a dissembler of his views. For instance, he was once asked on a television show if he agreed with the scientist who remarked that the more he studied science the more he was sure about the existence of God.

> Dr. Pauling said mildly: "My experience has been different, in a sense almost opposite."
>
> And in a speech in 1950 he said that "this problem of an atomic war must not be confused by minor problems such as communism versus capitalism."

"Statements such as these," says the *Times,* "together with the fact that he has sometimes lent his voice to leftist groups, have brought accusations that he is a Communist. This he has denied under oath. He insists, however, on the right to speak his mind and associate with anyone he pleases."

A Challenge to Orthodox Christianity

The Lost Years of Jesus Revealed, by the Reverend Charles Francis Potter—a paperback (Gold Medal) available at neighborhood stores—evaluates the material found in *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes,* by Professor A. Dupont-Sommers (Theosophy 44: 474), in relation to its effect on the orthodox laity. Dr. Potter is especially concerned with the way this information has been "played down" in the United States because of the controversial nature of the material and the reluctance of theologians to accept its challenge. In his prologue, Dr. Potter speculates:

> Now that the proven Mother of Christianity is known to have been the prior Community of the New Covenant commonly called the Essenes, the momentous question challenging the conscience of all Christendom is whether the child will have the grace, courage, and honesty to acknowledge and honor its own mother!
>
> To date, the theologians have had time enough to tell their communicants the epochal significance of the findings of the Essene library, but their utterances have been—especially in America—singularly hesitant, reluctant, and incomplete. . . . The gradual spreading of information as to the nature and significance of the Qumran cave finds, however, cannot be prevented and will most certainly disturb all of our church-going people.

The Word of God or the Work of Man?

The Fundamentalist sects, says Dr. Potter, are today the fastest-growing. Apropos of this, Dr. Potter continues:

> Imagine telling him [the Fundamentalist] that the Essene Scrolls will show many of his sacred and trusted Bible chapters to be inaccurate, garbled, and both expurgated and interpolated, theologically. . . . There is hardly a book in the Old Testament that will not need corrections and improved readings in the light of the Qumran manuscripts,

nor a New Testament book that will not suffer considerable reinterpretation of key verses on which doctrines depend. . . . The very vulnerable doctrine of the Holy Spirit will have to go, as we shall see, and will take with it inevitably the doctrine of the Trinity, which was never in the Bible anyway.

Cardinal Dogmas will Have to Go

There is enough evidence at hand, Dr. Potter asserts, to show that "Jesus was not a miraculous incarnation of a Son of God," but "the natural outgrowth, flowering, and fruiting of the living, thinking, suffering and teaching of many generations of Hebrew prophets and lawgivers, priests and students, religious leaders and ethical teachers." "Unfortunately," says Dr. Potter:

> The more orthodox Christian leaders refuse to admit that the manuscripts from the Qumran caves are extremely important and will make necessary not only the revision of most of the books of the Bible but also the re-writing of the history of Christian origins. And they oppose the reconsideration and restating of cardinal Christian theological dogmas, if not the abandoning of such doctrines as the special inspiration of canonical Scripture, the incarnation, the virgin birth, the bodily resurrection, and the transubstantiation miracle in the eucharist. . . .
>
> There may be nothing to disturb the faith of the ordinary unobservant Christian who reads the Manual and the Psalms after being assured there is no danger there. Nor is there anything in all the hundreds of cave manuscripts, Enoch and all the rest, to disturb the faith of a Unitarian, for instance, who does not believe in the deity of Jesus, nor in special miraculous revelations, virgin birth, bodily resurrection, salvation, atonement, and similar orthodox dogmas.

An Interesting Theory

We have in no sense done justice to Dr. Potter's résumé of the Dead Sea Scrolls, in which there are ideas reminiscent of H. P. Blavatsky's outspoken criticism of professional churchmen. Dr. Potter cites chapter and verse in samples of the "doctoring of the Scriptures by the D.D. Theologians, either by the insertion of words, phrases, and whole sentences, or by the elimination of others, in order to make the Bible prove the theological points they wished to make." Dr. Potter's concluding section propounds an interesting theory:

> The widely heralded and acclaimed "return" of religion and the churches has probably been due not so much to the attractions of theology, which interests people very little even when they understand it, but more likely to the new and growing fascination of the study of

the psychology of personality, hence the quickened interest in the greatest personality of all time. Whether we approve of the trend or not, we are blind and deaf if we do not recognize that psychology is rapidly gaining on theology, if not superseding it, as the attraction, explanation, and dominating factor in modern religion. . . .

The first-century followers of Jesus and the theologians and their successors can be excused to some extent for failing to perceive that he was no god come down from heaven, but rather a very great human being, ahead of his time in his intuitive understanding of his fellows and in his apparently instinctive knowledge of the teachings of what we now call psychotherapy. They can be forgiven, for they had not studied psychology, as had the early followers of Gautama the Buddha, who preached salvation by the psychological suppression of vain desires. And it should be noted that the early disciples of the Buddha did not deify him, although he lived and died five centuries before Jesus.

No Excuse Today

But the present-day followers of Jesus, and modern Christian theologians, living in a day when the knowledge of the principles of psychology is available to almost anyone who cares to learn them, have no excuse for using the very limited and inadequate thought-forms of the Palestine people of two thousand years ago to explain the personality and character of this splendid leader and teacher of men, who was perceptive, keenly intelligent, sympathetic, comprehending all the vices, virtues, and motives of humans, a man who took the best he had read and thought, and interpreted it to humanity by embodying it in his own life.

He demonstrated truth, he incarnated righteousness; but that did not prove he was a supernatural being. It is Jesus the Man who understood men, whom men want to know and have always wanted to know. And the Scrolls from the Salty Sea fascinate us because they may throw some light on what he studied and thought and what his radiant personality really was before the theologians made a god out of him.

Thus, the contentions which were so startling when *Isis Unveiled* was published are now "established facts" in the light of the Dead Sea Scrolls; and cannot fail, we think, to affect the "race mind" through such a book as *The Lost Years of Jesus Revealed.*

Religion's Upsurge, a Delusion?

Omar Garrison (in the Los Angeles *Mirror News,* June 7), quotes extensively from a *Holiday* article by Dr. Bergen Evans of Northwestern University. "Dr. Evans," says Mr. Garrison, "points out that every

age has its delusions or myths. Ours are statistical, scientific, progressive. They must seem reasonable and factual, though they need not accord with the facts or even with each other. Their function is to reassure, to give us a comfortable sense of knowing it all and to offer what seems a simple remedy." Mr. Garrison continues:

> Dr. Evans admits that at first glance there seems to be a great upsurge in religious belief in the United States. He notes that everywhere we turn in our society today we find religion in one guise or another.
>
> Even bathing beauty contests and football games are opened with prayer. Records with religious themes are jukebox hits. . . . . Shops sell plastic place-settings of the Last Supper and jigsaw puzzles of the Crucifixion.

Glaring Inconsistencies

Mr. Garrison quotes Dr. Evans:

> The Bible has been distorted and watered down into comic books. Communion is now sometimes served buffet style; baptismal fonts have hot and cold running water; and Sacred Hearts and crucifixes glow in the dark.
>
> We can take the waters of the spirit on the run, as express trains scoop water up from troughs between the tracks.
>
> When we travel, railroad dining cars provide a choice of printed prayers, free with meals. There are prayers for Catholics, Protestants and for Jews. Mohammedans, apparently, must bring their own prayer rugs—and doubters their own lunch.
>
> Even our government and military leaders have been caught up in the fever of the religious boom. . . . When the Navy launched its Vanguard satellite, a St. Christopher medal was attached "to add Divine Guidance."

Dr. Evans comments: "To exactly what base blend of politics, piety and puerility this false belief in religious revival is to be attributed, God alone knows. But if we have reached the stage where it can't be distinguished from religion, we can have very little religion left."

Drug-Resisting Germs

A situation alarming to medical men is discussed by Gunnar Gundersen, M.D., President-elect of the American Medical Association, in *This Week* for June 22. It seems that certain strains of Staphylococcus, a common germ which causes boils and other local skin infections, "have developed almost complete immunity against at least one powerful antibiotic, penicillin, that formerly seemed to be 100 per cent lethal for

them." Immunity results much more quickly, Dr. Gundersen says, when the germs are "exposed to *small* amounts from time to time." He continues:

> Our cue from this is to avoid indiscriminate taking of medicines that should be reserved for really serious conditions. It is still true that this type of "crash" program works very well. But its value will be steadily lessened if people keep on using sulfas and antibiotics as popguns instead of cannon.

Man Working Against Himself

> Almost every family has erred in this respect. Someone with a bad cold has decided to take a couple of the antibiotic tablets left over after grandfather pulled through a tough bout with pneumonia. That sulfa or antibiotic ointment that was so successful against Junior's impetigo may be tried by older sister as a pimple treatment. We should avoid such practices, because with them we are actually working against ourselves.

We are protected to some extent by law, which prohibits over-the-counter sale of these powerful drugs, Dr. Gundersen points out, but only our own common sense can protect us from raiding the family medicine cabinet.

Nature's Antibodies

"The second lesson from these resistant germs," says Dr. Gundersen, "might be highly important to succeeding generations of humans;" for—

> As with germs, human immunity is kept at a safe high level only by exercising it. The body has antibody resources constantly on the alert to combat invading infections. Unless these defenses get a workout now and then, they may forget how to perform their tasks. I would say there is very little risk involved in letting our bodies carry on some of this defensive action, without using "wonder drugs" at the slightest sign of trouble. If the immunization defenses are not adequate, then it is time to call up the medical reserves.

It might also be well to review what H. P. Blavatsky says in *The Secret Doctrine* about the "fiery lives," and note particularly how the same "life" may be at one time and in one condition a "creator," yet at another time and under other conditions become a "destroyer."

Potency of the Death Wish

The Cincinnati *Enquirer,* March 23, reports on a case history given by George C. Raines, Navy psychiatrist, in "discussing the strange phe-

nomenon of persons committing suicide by wishing for death":

> Mrs. J., age 65, had been in the psychiatrist's office approximately 10 minutes, discussing her problems, when she fell over dead.
>
> The woman had been suffering from asthma, but that wasn't what had killed her. An autopsy was performed. It showed she had been in fairly good physical health. She had taken no poisoning drug. She had neither shot nor stabbed herself. In fact, there wasn't a bruise on her body. In the absence of even the slightest medical cause, doctors decided Mrs. J. had killed herself solely through her own "will." She had wished herself to death.
>
> She had no previous history of mental illness and had never before had psychiatric treatment, Dr. Raines added, and those few minutes she spent with the psychiatrist were long enough to bring the disturbances welling into consciousness and kill her.

The Power of Thought

Dr. Raines recounts other examples of fulfilled wishes for death, then continues:

> Countless numbers of American soldiers died in Japanese prison camps during World War II because of the death wish. These unfortunate beings found their lives had become intolerable and lost the will to live. They may have been physically healthy, but they died simply because they wished it.

Dr. Raines does not believe that everyone can wish himself to death, and those who do "are not any particular type of individual." He cites the "boning" of the Australian natives (the witch doctor points a bone at his victim) as an example of primitive use of the death wish. It is well known by anthropologists and ethnologists that the human objects of "boning" invariably die.

Plastic Potency

Among primitive peoples, the "boning" and other allied forms of black magic are performed by the medicine man—one who has, presumably, developed what, in "Dialogues Between the two Editors," H.P.B. calls "plastic potency";

> H.P.B. . . . You asked me if we are punished for our thoughts. Not for all, for some are still-born; but for the others, those which we call "silent" but potential thoughts—yes. Take an extreme case, such as that of a person who is so wicked as to wish the death of another. Unless the evil-wisher is a *Dugpa,* a high adept in black magic, in which case Karma is delayed, such a wish only *comes back to roost.* (Italics ours.)

M.C. But supposing the evil-wisher to have a very strong will, without being a *dugpa,* could the death of the other be accomplished?

H.P.B. Only if the malicious person has the evil eye, which simply means possessing enormous plastic power of imagination working involuntarily, and thus turned unconsciously to bad uses. For what is the power of the "evil eye"? Simply a great plastic power of thought, so great as to produce a current impregnated with the potentiality of every kind of misfortune and accident, which inoculates, or attaches itself to, any person who comes within it. . . .

Earlier in the same article, H.P.B. says "The plastic power of the imagination is much stronger in some persons than in others. . . . Optimism and pessimism depend on it also in a large measure."

H.P.B. Birthday Observance

On Aug. 11—in one case Aug. 12—in several Western cities, Theosophists and students of H. P. Blavatsky met to honor H.P.B. and to consider the Objects of the Movement of which she was the chief founder. H.P.B. was born at midnight, Aug. 11-12, 1831, and these meetings were held in the form of a "Birthday Observance," sponsored by independent groups or committees of Theosophists, without regard for organization, although the sponsoring committees extended invitations to the members of all groups. In Los Angeles, the Birthday Observance was held at Theosophy Hall, the place of U.L.T. meetings. The San Francisco meeting was held at the Women's City Club. Other meetings were held (at the Theosophical Society Room) in Sacramento, Calif., and (at the U.L.T. Lodge) in Phoenix, Ariz.

According to various reports, students attending these meetings felt that this opportunity for all Theosophists to join in honor of H. P. Blavatsky was a happy inspiration, bringing them together in that nonsectarian spirit which was to H.P.B. the breath of the Theosophical Movement. Programs of these several meetings were varied. In Los Angeles, the Three Objects of the Movement, declared by H.P.B. and adopted by all societies and groups, were made the subjects of short talks and discussion. In San Francisco, a lecture was given on the life and work of H.P.B., and similar subjects were considered at Sacramento and Phoenix. There was good attendance at all the meetings and friendship and good will prevailed in the after-meeting gatherings.

THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS

DECLARATION

The policy of this Lodge is independent devotion to the cause of Theosophy, without professing attachment to any Theosophical organization. It is loyal to the great Founders of the Theosophical Movement, but does not concern itself with dissensions or differences of individual opinion.

The work it has on hand and the end it keeps in view are too absorbing and too lofty to leave it the time or inclination to take part in side issues. That work and that end is the dissemination of the Fundamental Principles of the philosophy of Theosophy, and the exemplification in practice of those principles, through a truer realization of the SELF; a profounder conviction of Universal Brotherhood.

It holds that the unassailable basis for union among Theosophists, wherever and however situated, is "similarity of aim, purpose and teaching," and therefore has neither Constitution, By-Laws nor Officers, the sole bond between its Associates being that basis. And it aims to disseminate this idea among Theosophists in the furtherance of Unity.

It regards as Theosophists all who are engaged in the true service of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, condition or organization, and

It welcomes to its association all those who are in accord with its declared purposes and who desire to fit themselves, by study and otherwise, to be the better able to help and teach others.

"The true Theosophist belongs to no cult or sect: yet belongs to each and all."

Being in sympathy with the purposes of this Lodge, as set forth in its "Declaration," I hereby record my desire to be enrolled as an Associate, it being understood that such association calls for no obligation on my part, other than that which I, myself, determine.

The foregoing is the form signed by Associates of the United Lodge of Theosophists. Inquiries are invited from all persons to whom this Movement may appeal. Cards for signatures will be sent upon request, and every possible assistance furnished Associates in their studies and in efforts to form local Lodges. There are no fees of any kind, and no formalities to be complied with. Write to:

GENERAL REGISTRAR, UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS,
Theosophy Hall, 33rd and Grand Ave., Los Angeles 7, Calif.

U. L. T. LODGES

AMSTERDAM, Z. HOLLAND	123 Stadionweg
ANTWERP, (BERCHEM) BELGIUM	Transvaal Straat 62
BANGALORE CITY, INDIA	15 Sir Krishna Rao Rd., Basavangudi
BERKELEY 4, CALIFORNIA	Masonic Temple Bldg., Bancroft and Shattuck
BOMBAY 1, INDIA	Theosophy Hall, 40 New Marine Lines
LAGUNA BEACH, CALIFORNIA	1175 South Coast Boulevard
LEIDEN, HOLLAND	Roodenburgerstraat 35
LONDON W. 2, ENGLAND	Robert Crosbie House, 62 Queen's Gardens
LONDON, ONTARIO, CANADA	524 William Street
LOS ANGELES 7, CALIFORNIA	245 West 33rd Street
MATUNGA, BOMBAY 19, INDIA	Anandi Nivas, Bhaudaji Road
NEW YORK 21, NEW YORK	347 East 72nd Street
PARIS 16, FRANCE	11 bis rue Keppler
PHILADELPHIA 3, PENNSYLVANIA	1917 Walnut Street
PHOENIX, ARIZONA	77 West Encanto Boulevard
READING, PENNSYLVANIA	812 North Fifth Street
SACRAMENTO 14, CALIFORNIA	720 - 13th Street
SAN DIEGO 3, CALIFORNIA	3148 Fifth Avenue
SAN FRANCISCO 14, CALIFORNIA	166 Sanchez Street
SAN LEANDRO, CALIFORNIA	579 Foothill Boulevard
SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA	Federation House, 166 Phillip Street
WASHINGTON 9, D. C.	1722 Connecticut Ave., N.W.

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLICATIONS

Books by H. P. Blavatsky:

Isis Unveiled, a photographic facsimile of the Original Edition, the two volumes bound in one	$ 7.50
The Secret Doctrine, facsimile edition, two volumes in one	8.50
Index to the Secret Doctrine, for students	4.00
The Secret Doctrine *and* Index	12.00
The Key to Theosophy, facsimile of Original Edition	3.00
Theosophical Glossary, facsimile of Original Edition	5.00
Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge	2.50
The Voice of the Silence	1.50

Books by William Q. Judge:

The Ocean of Theosophy	2.00
Letters That Have Helped Me, new and enlarged edition	3.00
The Bhagavad-Gita	1.50
Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita	2.50
Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms	2.00
The Heart Doctrine, selections from Wm. Q. Judge	2.00
Vernal Blooms, selected articles from W.Q.J. (paper cover)	1.00

Other Books:

The Friendly Philosopher, Letters and Talks by Robert Crosbie	3.00
Answers to Questions on the "Ocean," by Robert Crosbie	2.00
The Eternal Verities, for children, new edition	3.50
Teacher's Manual and Guide to the "Eternal Verities"	2.50
"Because—" for the Children Who Ask Why	2.00
Light on the Path, Bombay Edition	1.50
Through the Gates of Gold, written down by "M.C."	1.50
Occult Tales, by H. P. Blavatsky and Wm. Q. Judge	2.00
From the Book of Images, a volume of Indian tales	3.00
The Theosophical Movement, 1875-1950	5.00
Selections from the Upanishads, and the Tao Te King	2.00
The Dhammapada	2.00

Pamphlets:

Theosophy Simply Stated (10 copies, 50 cents; 50 copies, $2.00)	.10
Conversations on Theosophy, including the "Three Fundamentals"	.10
Reincarnation and Karma, the "Aphorisms," by Wm. Q. Judge	.10
Thoughts for Thinkers, a helpful essay	.10
What is Death?	.10
The Vocation of Life	.10
The United Lodge of Theosophists, its history, purpose, and methods	.25
Five Messages to American Theosophists, by H. P. Blavatsky	.25
Epitome of Theosophy, by William Q. Judge	.25
Echoes from the Orient, by William Q. Judge	.50
Moral Education, new and enlarged edition	.50
A Christian and a Theosophist	.25
The Laws of Healing, Physical and Metaphysical	.50
States After Death, and Spiritualistic "Communications" Explained	.35
Cycles of Psychism, The Import of Psychic Evolution	.50
Hypnotism—A Psychic Malpractice	.25
What is Theosophy? A collation from H. P. Blavatsky	.25

Prices subject to change without notice. Order from

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY

245 West 33rd Street, Los Angeles 7, California
347 East 72nd Street, New York 21. New York